

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this Application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-19 and 21-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628 (hereinafter “Anuff”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0010598 (hereinafter “Bales”). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff, in view of Bales, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,538,673 (hereinafter “Maslov”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-29 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Anuff, Bales, and Maslov.

In regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit this the claims sufficiently define the extent to which the recited “software coding” represents a portlet. For example, as recited in claim 1 “software coding ... that represents a portlet being designed by the first user of the second computer system” is generated “during the first interactive session with the one or more graphical user interfaces based on the data source specification and the layout specification.” As recited, the portlet is “configured by the software coding to obtain data from the first data source and to create at least one visual representation according to the first layout style within the portal when included on the portal page of the data obtained from the first data source.” As discussed in the Specification, “software code is generated using the declarative specification where the software code generates portlet 102.” (Application: Paragraph [0071]).

Accordingly, it is clear that as recited in claim 1:

software coding (generates/creates) → portlet (generates/creates) → information display

Thus, as recited, there is a difference between software coding that represents a portlet and an information display or visual representation created by the portlet.

Anuff merely allows users to dynamically change the information display or visual representation of data create by a portlet by specifying the data source and layout of pre-

created modules. Anuff does not disclose or suggest that users can create their own modules as recited in claim 1. The Office Action recognizes this in the reliance on Bales.

Bales may be understood to allow users to create their own modules. However, the combination of Anuff and Bales still does not disclose the limitation of “generating software coding using the computer system that represents a portlet being designed by the first user of the second computer system during the first interactive session with the one or more graphical user interfaces based on the data source specification and the layout specification” as recited in claim 1.

As recited, during an interactive session to construct software code representing portlets, two user interfaces are used. A first allows create of a data source specification and the second allows creation of a layout specification. As recited, each of these two user declared specifications are used to generated the software coding representing a portlet.

In contrast to claim 1, the combination of Anuff and Bales fails to disclose or suggest both of these user interfaces in the creation of portlets. Anuff merely allows users to modify the information display or visual representation of a portlet using a plurality of user interfaces. Yet, the portlets in Anuff have been pre-created and thus Anuff does not suggest using the user interfaces in the manner recited in claim 1 to create the modules.

Additionally, while Bales allows users to specify a data source for a module, Bales fails to cure the deficiencies of Anuff or provide a reason to modify the user interfaces of Anuff to disclose both interfaces recited in claim 1. Specifically, Bales fails to disclose or suggest the second user interface as cited in claim 1 presenting one or more layout styles for data from the data source.

On page 11, the Office Action alleges without support that Bales also teaches “determining the layout of a portlet via one of a plurality of user interfaces presented to a user.” Yet, this conclusion lacks evidentiary support and/or a convincing line of reasoning. None of the user interfaces in the figures of Bales disclose or suggest presenting one or more layout styles for data from a data source as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action also fails to establish a convincing reason why the user interfaces in Anuff that modify the output of a module should be modified without changing their mode of operation for use in creating modules with the interfaces in Bales to arrive at the interfaces recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections to claim 1-29.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, such as to clarify the terminology, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
62342332 v1